

December 2, 1974

ture of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment of the committee amendment and third reading of the bill.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read a third time.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, if the Senator from South Dakota is prepared to yield back the remainder of his time, I am prepared to yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ABOUREZK. Mr. President, I am prepared to yield back my time so that we can have a vote on passage.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Has all time been yielded back?

Mr. ABOUREZK. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. METCALF. I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. GOLDWATER. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second? There is a sufficient second.

The yeas and the nays were ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass? The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The second assistant legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUDSPLETON), the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON), the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE) is absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT), and the Senator from South

Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PRECY) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 72, nays 0, as follows:

(No. 510 Leg.)

YEAS—72

Abourezk	Goldwater	Meitzenbaum
Aiken	Gravel	Mondale
Allen	Grain	Montoya
Baker	Gurney	Moss
Bartlett	Hansen	Muskie
Bayh	Hart	Nelson
Beall	Haskell	Nunn
Bennett	Hatch	Packwood
Bible	Hathaway	Pearson
Brock	Helms	Pel
Buckley	Hollings	Proxmire
Burdick	Hruska	Randolph
Byrd	Hughes	Riklcoff
Harry F., Jr.	Inouye	Schweiker
Byrd, Robert C.	Jackson	Scott, Hugh
Cannon	Javits	Sparkman
Chiles	Johnson	Stafford
Clark	Long	Stennis
Cook	Mansfield	Stevens
Dole	McDellan	Tower
Domenici	McGuire	Tunney
Dominick	McGee	Weicker
Eagleton	McGovern	Young
Fannin	McIntyre	
Fong	Metcalf	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—28

Bellmon	Ervin	Roth
Bentsen	Fulbright	Scott,
Biden	Hartke	William L.
Brooke	Huddleston	Stevenson
Case	Humphrey	Symington
Church	Kennedy	Taft
Cotton	Magnuson	Talmadge
Cranston	Mathias	Thurmond
Curtis	Pastore	Williams
Eastland	Percy	

So the bill (H.R. 10337) was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to provide for final settlement of the conflicting rights and interests of the Hopi and Navajo Tribes to and in lands lying within the joint use area of the reservation established by the Executive order of December 16, 1882, and lands lying within the reservation created by the act of June 14, 1934, and for other purposes."

#### AMENDMENT OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of the conference report on the Export-Import Bank.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The conference report on H.R. 15977, will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15977) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses this report, signed by a majority of the conferees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the conference report.

#### CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. PACKWOOD. Mr. President, I send to the desk a cloture motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK). The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair, without objection, directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

#### CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of Rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, hereby move to bring to a close the debate upon the adoption of the conference report on H.R. 15977, the Export-Import Bank Act Amendment.

Bob Packwood, Robert P. Griffin, Lee Metcalf, Mike Mansfield, Hugh Scott, J. Glenn Beall, Jr., Joseph M. Montoya, Howard H. Baker, Jr., Frank E. Moss, Wallace F. Bennett, Robert T. Stafford, Edmund S. Muskie, John Tower, Thomas J. McIntyre, Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., Harold E. Hughes, Bill Brock.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

#### FOREIGN ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1974—S. 3394

AMENDMENT NO. 2001

(Ordered to be printed and to lie on the table.)

#### WHY REWARD THE U.N.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the American Ambassador to the United Nations and such distinguished U.S. Senators as HUBERT H. HUMPHREY of Minnesota and GALE W. MCGEE of Wyoming have taken the view that, to use Senator HUMPHREY's words:

The United Nations Charter as adopted by the Congress of the United States and ratified by the Senate, has the same standing as a provision of our Constitution. It is a supreme law of the land.

Of course, I totally reject such an extremist view.

But if there is widespread belief that United Nations actions is legally binding on the United States, I would think that even the most ardent advocates of world government would begin to have second thoughts as the result of U.N. activity during the month of November.

First, the United Nations ousted a legitimate member, South Africa, because of that country's internal policies. This is in specific violation of the U.N. Charter which prohibits interference in the domestic affairs of a member state.

Then having silenced the voice and vote of a duly constituted member, the United Nations followed that up the next day with this action: It provided a forum and treated as it would a head of state the leader of a terrorist group known as the Palestine Liberation Organization. The PLO not only objects to the internal policies of a United Nations member and sovereign state, Israel, but actually challenges its existence as a nation. In addition, the U.N. gave the terrorist organization official observer status.

A militant, unreasonable majority

the facts, to find out who lived on the land in 1934, and to make the determination as a result of that investigation.

I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, before the debate on this issue is brought to a close, I would like to extend my appreciation to the minority members of our committee for their diligent work and attendance at committee hearings, and the great help they have given us. The Senator from Oklahoma now in the chair (Mr. BARTLETT) was extremely helpful, and also my colleague from Arizona (Mr. GOLDWATER), who is probably the best-versed Member of the Senate on Indian affairs. For years he has dealt with our Indian people, not only in Arizona but throughout the Nation. It was through his great help, patience, and understanding that we have been able to come to many of the conclusions that have been incorporated in the bill.

So I pay deserved tribute to him, and express my appreciation.

From the majority members of the committee, we have had excellent cooperation. The distinguished Senator from Montana (Mr. METCALF) not only has cooperated with us in this particular instance, but we have had the pleasure of working with him for several years on the Indian Affairs Subcommittee, and I feel that he has done a great service in taking over a very difficult situation, not only in this instance but in many others.

I feel that the tributes that have been paid to him are certainly well deserved.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is all remaining time yielded back?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. ABOUREZK. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, before yielding back my time, I yield to the assistant majority leader, the Senator from West Virginia, for a unanimous-consent request.

#### UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I have been asked by the distinguished majority leader to propound the following unanimous-consent request:

That when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 10:30 a.m. tomorrow;

That at 11 a.m. tomorrow, the 1 hour of debate under rule XXII on the motion to invoke cloture on the conference report on H.R. 15977, the Export-Import Bank Act amendments, begin running, and that upon the disposition of that vote on cloture, if the vote to invoke cloture fails, the Senate then proceed to the consideration of S. 3394, the bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961; and

That at 4 p.m. tomorrow, if the message from the House of Representatives is available, the Senate proceed to vote on the overriding of the President's veto of the GI educational benefits bill, with one-half hour prior to that time, to be equally divided between the majority leader and the minority leader or their designees, for the purpose of debating the override.

Both of those votes will be mandatorily rollcall votes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

#### SURFACE RIGHTS IN THE 1934 NAVAJO RESERVATION

The Senate continued with the consideration of the bill (H.R. 10337) to authorize the partition of the surface rights in the joint use area of the 1882 Executive order Hopi Reservation and the surface and subsurface rights in the 1934 Navajo Reservation between the Hopi and Navajo Tribes, to provide for allotments to certain Paiute Indians, and for other purposes.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Bill VanNess of the staff of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be accorded the privilege of the floor for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, no discussion of the Navajo-Hopi land disputes would be complete without our paying tribute to the dedication and hard work the distinguished Senators from Arizona, Mr. FANNIN and Mr. GOLDWATER, have addressed to these issues over the years.

Their work on H.R. 10337 has been difficult because members of both tribes reside in Arizona. But, in my opinion, they have always exhibited a desire to achieve justice and equity for both groups and bring this unfortunate inter-tribal land dispute to an end.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BARTLETT). All remaining time having been yielded back, the question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Montana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. METCALF. I yield back the remainder of my time on the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. METCALF. We vote first on the Montoya amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. On this question, the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. I announce that the Senator from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. BIDEN), the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH), the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON), the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. EASTLAND), the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. ERVIN), the Senator from Indiana (Mr. HARTKE), the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. HUMPHRIES), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), the Senator from Illinois (Mr. STEVENSON),

the Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), and the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT) are necessarily absent.

I further announce that the Senator from Georgia (Mr. TALMADGE) is absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Rhode Island (Mr. PASTORE), the Senator from Washington (Mr. MAGNUSON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY), and the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. HUMPHREY) would each vote "yea."

Mr. GRIFFIN. I announce that the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. BELLMON), the Senator from Massachusetts (Mr. BROOKE), the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. CASE), the Senator from New Hampshire (Mr. COTTON), the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS), the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS), the Senator from Delaware (Mr. ROTH), the Senator from Virginia (Mr. WILLIAM L. SCOTT), and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) are necessarily absent.

I also announce that the Senator from Illinois (Mr. PERCY) and the Senator from Ohio (Mr. TAFT) are absent on official business.

I further announce that, if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland (Mr. MATHIAS) and the Senator from South Carolina (Mr. THURMOND) would each vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 37, nays 35, as follows:

[No. 509 Leg.]

YEAS—37

Abourezk	Jackson	Packwood
Bayh	Javits	Pell
Byrd, Robert C.	Johnston	Proxmire
Chiles	Long	Randolph
Clark	Manfield	Ribicoff
Domenici	McClellan	Schweiker
Eagleton	McGee	Sparkman
Gravel	McGovern	Steffens
Hatfield	Mondale	Tunney
Hathaway	Montoya	Weicker
Hollings	Muskie	
Hughes	Nelson	
Inouye	Nunn	

NAYS—35

Aiken	Cannon	Helms
Allen	Cook	Hruska
Baker	Dole	McClure
Bartlett	Domnick	McIntyre
Beall	Fannin	Metcalf
Bennett	Fong	Metzenbaum
Bible	Goldwater	Moss
Brock	Grimm	Pearson
Buckley	Gurney	Scott, Hugh
Burdick	Hansen	Stevens
Byrd	Hart	Tower
Harry F., Jr.	Haskell	Young

NOT VOTING—28

Belmont	Ervin	Roth
Bentsen	Fulbright	Scott
Biden	Hartke	William L.
Brooke	Huddleston	Stevenson
Case	Humphrey	Symington
Church	Kennedy	Taft
Cotton	Magnuson	Talmadge
Cranston	Mathias	Thurmond
Curtis	Pastore	Williams
Eastland	Percy	

So Mr. MONTAYA's amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further amendment to be proposed, the question is on agreeing to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The committee amendment in the na-

December 2, 1974

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

within the United Nations is running roughshod over the principles and character of the world organization.

I speak as one who over the years has supported the United Nations. Indeed, I have felt a personal rapport with the world organization, having returned from Okinawa in the far Pacific in World War II on the same day the United Nations was formed.

As a young naval officer who had seen 4 years of war, it was my deep hope that the new world organization would make it unnecessary for young Americans of the future to go to foreign lands to fight.

But, alas, what a disappointment the United Nations has been.

During the 29 years that have passed since its formation, its character and composition have changed radically.

Originally having a membership of 51 countries, all with long-established records of government, it now has 138 members, most having come into being only in recent years.

It is dominated by the African, Asian, and Communist bloc nations, which have 64 percent of the total membership.

The United States is pathetic in its importance. On the motion to oust South Africa, which the United States strongly opposed, our country was able to muster only 22 votes—against 91 affirmative votes.

On the resolution permitting the terrorist Arafat to address the United Nations, the United States found itself with only three allies—with 105 nations in opposition. On the motion to give official observer status to the Arafat group, the vote was 95 to 17.

The United States, which puts up most of the money to run the world organization, and which has been shamelessly courting the African and Asian nations, has received in return nothing but contempt.

Perhaps United Nations members recall that the United States in 1966 supported a clear violation of the United Nations Charter—by voting an embargo on trade with Rhodesia.

The late Secretary of State Dean Acheson accurately called the U.N. action "bare-faced aggression, unprovoked and unjustified by a single legal or moral principle."

The United Nations Charter clearly specifies that an embargo can be imposed only if a nation is a threat to peace.

Secretary of State Kissinger testified before the Senate Committee on Finance that Rhodesia is not a threat to world peace, although he supports the embargo.

I cite my question and Secretary Kissinger's reply, March 7, 1974:

Senator BYRD. In your judgment, is Rhodesia a threat to world peace?

Secretary KISSINGER. No.

So the United States itself helped lay the foundation for the reckless disregard of the Charter requirements voted by the militant majority this past month of November.

The United States having itself disregarded the Charter is not an effective protester if others choose to follow her example.

The time has come for those representing the United States in the United Na-

tions to stand on principle; to cease trying to buy friendship.

When the Republic of China was recently expelled from the U.N., of the 59 U.N. members who voted to expel the Republic, all but 8 have been recipients of U.S. aid. The total they have received amounts to some \$47 billion.

Even now our State Department is not willing to be frank. For example, in the argument against the expulsion of South Africa, it chose the devious route of basing its case on the assertion that South Africa could best be encouraged to change its internal policies by continuing as a member of the United Nations. The fact is the U.N. has no right to interfere in the internal affairs of a member nation—unless that nation is a threat to peace.

C. L. Sulzberger, the chief correspondent for the New York Times, reports the domestic policies of some of those countries which voted to expel South Africa.

"The black state of Uganda," according to Mr. Sulzberger, "is involved in one of the weirdest, most cruel patterns of government brutality—chopping up opponents and feeding them to crocodiles." Mr. Sulzberger observes that "this is not a lesser sin than South African segregation."

Mr. Sulzberger reports that Chad, which voted to oust South Africa sometimes "buries Christians alive in ant hills."

If other examples are needed, what about Russia's brutal invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968, or her action toward the Hungarians at an earlier date?

Yes, the U.N. has forfeited world respect, even to the point that the Washington Post, a liberal and internationalist publication, suggests that the United States should suspend its participation until there is a change of policy.

The United States should demand, too, that the U.N. put its financial affairs in order and cease relying on the United States for such heavy contributions. Since the creation of the U.N. the United States has contributed some \$4.7 billion.

Of the 138 members in the United Nations, 92 have an outstanding debt of \$204 million in back dues. The Soviet Union and its two member Republics of Byelorussia and the Ukraine owe \$110 million.

The foreign aid authorization bill—which the Senate will consider tomorrow—provides a total of \$194,000,000 for the U.N. This is an increase of \$37,552,000—or 24 percent.

How can a 24-percent increase in funds for the United Nations be justified?

Why should the United States reward the United Nations with an increase in its contribution?

In my judgment, the wage earners of this country who pay the taxes will not welcome such an increased expenditure.

I shall give the Senate an opportunity to express its view by presenting an amendment to the foreign aid bill, which will eliminate the proposed increase.

Now is the time for the Senate to stand up and be counted. It can save American tax dollars and simultaneously send a signal to those who are prostituting the purposes of the U.N.

Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to S. 3394, the Foreign Assistance Act. The amendment reads as follows:

At end of bill, add new section as follows: Notwithstanding any other provisions of this Act, total contributions authorized herein to the United Nations or to any segment or subdivision of this world organization shall not exceed \$156,148,000.

Mr. President, I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be printed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be received and printed and will lie on the table.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial in the Washington Post of November 14, 1974, entitled "Pretoria, the PLO and the U.N." be printed in the Record; that an editorial by C. L. Sulzberger, in the New York Times of November 16, 1974, be printed in the Record; that an editorial in the Richmond Times-Dispatch of November 16 be printed in the Record; that a column by William A. Rusher in the Philadelphia Inquirer be printed in the Record; that a column by Jeffry Hart in the Northern Virginia Daily of November 16 be printed in the Record; that a column by Vic Gold in the Washington Star-News of November 19 be printed in the Record; that an editorial in the Wall Street Journal of November 20, entitled "Terrorism and the U.N." be printed in the Record; that an editorial from the Richmond News Leader of November 18 be printed in the Record; that an editorial of the Northern Virginia Daily of November 20 be printed in the Record; that a column by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief of the Hearst Newspapers, entitled "A Triumph for Terror" be printed in the Record.

I might say that all of these deal with the United Nations.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 14, 1974]

PRETORIA, THE PLO AND THE U.N.

The United Nations General Assembly has done something indefensible, suspending South Africa because an Assembly majority wished to protest Pretoria's internal policies. Very few states could pass the arbitrary, interventionist political test which the majority applied to South Africa. What states have not, in the eyes of their adversaries, infringed on human rights or held on to territory not properly their own? The Soviet Union, for instance, has over time taken territory from some 15 of the 16 states it borders; it is, incontrovertibly, a police state. All too many African and Arab states practice at home policies of the grimmest and most repressive sort. It is a serious question, moreover, whether the Assembly's hypocrisy and showboating will help or hurt the cause of racial justice in South Africa. Does the majority care?

Needless to say, there is not the slightest justification in the U.N. Charter for the Assembly's action in suspending Pretoria for this current session. On the contrary, the fundamental principle of universality has been violated—the very principle which, many had hoped, had been confirmed once and for all by the seating of Peking. The United States and 21 other members voted against suspension. We wonder, however, if the United States does not condone the Assembly action—and thereby encourage the

Assembly to use the same tactic again, perhaps next against Israel—by continuing to participate in the work of this Assembly session. For the United States to suspend its participation until the principle of universality had been reaffirmed would add substance to its belief in that principle, as no speech or vote can. Self-suspension would no more amount to approval of South African apartheid than participation would amount to approval of, say, the slave trade in Saudi Arabia. The United States could continue its work in other branches of the United Nations. Such a step would be criticized by some other nations, and it would probably nourish—to the detriment of other American interests—the neo-isolationist current in American life. It would be, in short, a difficult and important decision.

Meanwhile, students of international life can contemplate this spectacle: On one day the General Assembly removes the seat, and silences the voice and vote, of a duly constituted member, a sovereign state, whose domestic policies it professes to abhor. On the very next day, the same Assembly gives a hearing to the chief of the Palestine Liberation Organization—an outfit that is not content merely to object to the internal policies of another member and sovereign state, Israel, but actually challenges its very existence as a nation. For all that Yasser Arafat's speech yesterday was a distinct disappointment to those who hope he will contribute constructively to a Mideast settlement, we happen to believe it is better to impose upon the PLO the responsibility of operating within a political forum than to leave it with no perceived alternative to terror. The very same logic, however, should be applied to Pretoria. The PLO and Pretoria both have their respective places—the former as a guest, the latter as a member—in the General Assembly, and for exactly the same reason: so that they can better be held to the standards of responsibility and respectability which, ideally, the international community upholds.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 16, 1974]

#### BENDING THE RULES OF THE U.N.

(By C. L. Sulzberger)

PARIS.—Twice this week the United Nations bent its traditions, if not its rules, first by inviting the head of a political movement, Yasser Arafat, to address its General Assembly as if he represented a government; and second by suspending South Africa's participation in the current session.

The chiefs of the Algerian, Cypriot and Mozambique guerrilla movements never were received—or even aspired to that honor. Yet Mr. Arafat staged a triumphant entry. A careful reading of the U.N. Charter shows no clause specifically barring participation—when invited—of a nonmember or a non-state, but it hasn't occurred before.

The case of South Africa is different although the two examples are implicitly related. Both stem from the preponderant fact of today's Assembly composition: a heavy majority of votes from the underdeveloped "third world," actively endorsed (despite their own rivalry) by Russia and China.

Gone are the days when, as with Korea, a strong pro-U.S. bloc could swing the international organization behind it.

United States diplomacy in the third world has been proven politically bankrupt.

American money helped put one after another former colony on its feet but American policy sought to compose so many contradictions and was often so ineptly expressed that its influence declined to virtually nil. Thus, for example, we are today in the position of being disliked in varying degree by India, Pakistan and Bangladesh.

There must be something wrong with our formulations if (while requesting more aid) so many nations oppose us. China, by con-

trast, has deliberately courted Afro-Asian favor and, with slight expenditure, has made great headway.

The United States opposition to Arafat's appearance at the U.N. came as no surprise because of our support for Israel. Washington also opposed the Assembly's suspension of South Africa.

In that action the U.N. ignored its constitution. Article Five stipulates that a suspension must be recommended by the Security Council. This was not done with South Africa. Moreover, one must review the roll of moral offenders during the U.N.'s history in order to judge this action.

I hasten to stress that, as anyone who has read my dispatches all these years must know, I have constantly opposed bigotry or racism in any form and specifically denounced Pretoria's policy of apartheid.

Right now, nevertheless, the black state of Uganda (which sits in the Assembly) is involved in one of the weirdest, most cruel patterns of government brutality. Chopping up opponents and feeding them to crocodiles is not a lesser sin than South African segregation. And Chad (which also voted) sometimes buries Christians alive in anthills.

When Stalin still ruled Russia, millions of its people were in prison camps or execution cellars. This was widely known even though Solzhenitsyn's "Gulag Archipelago" had yet to be written. But Russia remained a pillar of the U.N.

While thousands of Rumanians were dying along the fevered Danube-Black Sea canal, no one talked of "suspension." After Russia and its allies invaded Czechoslovakia in 1968—or Britain, France and Israel invaded Egypt in 1956—they stayed in the U.N. without more than a tut-tut.

Portugal ran a full-scale, three-pronged colonial war; Haiti was bullied by murderous *tonton macoutes* of Papa Doc Duvalier; and Indonesians (in 1965-66) slaughtered some 350,000 to 500,000 "Communists" (mostly Chinese minority), sometimes playing football with their heads. All stayed in the United Nations.

If an international organization intends to practice fair play—a basic objective of the U.N.—it should do so toward all. The dictates of a majority according to its prejudices one year should not automatically be embodied as a precedent for the future.

It might have been wiser to postpone Mr. Arafat's speech until he had formed a government in exile. His global standing remains to be formalized and one may only pray (dubiously) that arguing his case before the Assembly may lessen the possibility of another Middle East war. If such proves true, it will seem unfortunate that similar appearances weren't encouraged for earlier *de facto* political leaders.

To "suspend" South Africa is unfair emotionalism and as segregationist on a world scale as the silly, cruel discrimination that country practices at home. Above all, it was not only illogical to oust the Pretoria Government at a moment when it is showing serious signs of reform but blatantly unjust in terms of all other transgressors, past and present, who have smilingly kept and still keep their seats in so-called respectability's greatest club.

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, Nov. 16, 1974]

#### HITLER AND THE U.N.

If the spectacle at the United Nations this week did not shock and disgust many Americans, then Americans have become too jaded by varied atrocities to be shocked and disgusted by anything.

There was Yasser Arafat, the Palestinian terrorist leader, being whisked from Kennedy International Airport to the U.N. headquarters in a helicopter of the United States Army. Yasser Arafat and his entourage of

nomadic gunmen being protected by more than 1,000 American security officers, federal and local.

This is the same Yasser Arafat who has been accused of giving the orders to the Black September thugs who murdered American Ambassador Cleo A. Noel, American chargé d'affaires George C. Moore, and Belgian chargé d'affaires Guy Eid in the Saudi Arabian embassy at Khartoum, the Sudan, on March 2, 1973. Do we forget so soon? Do a fresh shave and flowery rhetoric make a statesman of a pistol-packing desert rat?

Accompanying Arafat were three guards who actually participated in the Khartoum slaughter of the unarmed diplomats, according to *The London Evening Standard*. The State Department has confirmed that at least one of the guards—Farouk Al Hussein—was in Khartoum at the time of the slayings, but the department said it did not have evidence that Hussein participated in the crime.

During his rambling 90-minute oration, Arafat sought to portray himself as a fearless fighter for an oppressed people rather than as a wanton terrorist. It is true to an extent that one man's terrorist is another man's freedom fighter, and vice versa. But a guerrilla foray against enemy defense installations is one thing; the slaughter of diplomats, Olympic athletes, and schoolchildren is quite another. Arafat and his gang have defiled their cause by their selection of the weak and the innocent as targets.

The UN General Assembly exhibited once again its own moral degeneration by according Arafat a warm greeting, including a standing ovation and all the protocol normally reserved for heads of state. Arafat's message was clearly and uncompromisingly revanchist: he would restore the Palestine that existed before 1948 and destroy the existing Jewish state.

Yet, it was the United Nations that decided in the aftermath of World War II and the Nazi holocaust that the historic Jewish aspiration for statehood ought to be honored. Palestinian Jews and the surviving remnants of European Jewry thus were given their state of Israel with the partition of Palestine. For Palestinian Arabs there remains a nation today; it is called Jordan.

All signs are that a UN now controlled by an Afro-Asian-Arab-Communist coalition whose ranks have been swollen by admission of many so-called "emerging" nations (many of them dictatorships) would side with Arafat in the desire that the UN-aided creation of Israel be repealed. This aim very likely could not be realized by actions short of a second holocaust for the Jewish people. It must be an especially bitter pill for a people that looked to the United Nations for moral leadership after Adolph Hitler to realize that the enemy has now become . . . the United Nations.

[From the Philadelphia Enquirer]

WHO NEEDS IT, ANYWAY?: THE U.N. HAS ROOM FOR THE PLO—BUT NOT SOUTH AFRICA

(By William A. Rusher)

If I were the government of South Africa, I would be sorely tempted to respond to the recent vote of the U. N. General Assembly, barring South Africa from voting or participating in this Assembly session, by withdrawing from the world organization altogether and telling it to go jump in the conveniently adjacent East River.

It is a constant source of amazement to me how seriously the U. N. appears to be taken by various grown-up countries that ought to know better.

Since approximately 1960, when it was taken over by the so-called "Third World" as a result of a heavy influx of new ex-colonial nations that had sprung up in Africa, the U. N. has served largely as a source of comfortable and remunerative employment



December 2, 1974

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 20343

for various lucky politicians who have outgrown the delights of Addis Ababa and Ougadougou.

Yet, save in a handful of the world's really important capitals, it is often seriously supposed, even by mature governments and peoples like those of South Africa, that the "deliberations" and votes of this comedic extravaganza really matter.

I can understand why the citizens of, say, Chad or Yemen might be favorably impressed with an organization willing to treat them as recognizable countries.

And I can certainly see the utility of the organization from the standpoint of somebody like Yasir Arafat, who is desperately seeking recognition and national status for his refugee Palestinians. But why on earth should any substantial existing government give a hoot what the U. N. does or says?

The latest and zaniest habit into which this little forum has fallen is withholding or withdrawing diplomatic recognition from sovereign governments, and/or conferring it on various guerrilla movements, depending on whether it happens to like them.

Thus the government of Rhodesia has never been admitted to the U.N., at all, though it presides over one of the pleasantest and (for blacks and whites alike) most prosperous regions in all Africa. And the government of the Republic of China or Taiwan was summarily dis-recognized in October 1971, despite the fact that its population of over 14 million people (larger than that of three-fourths of all U.N. members) enjoys a level of democracy, let alone prosperity, exceeded in the Far East only by Japan.

Also, it is quite likely that before long the Talleyrands of East 43rd St. will recognize something called the Government of Namibia—though it will have to be a government in exile, since South West Africa (which is Namibia's real name) is currently administered by the Republic of South Africa.

And it is by no means impossible that one of these days the U.N. will declare Puerto Rico independent of the United States, and accredit as its representatives the spokesmen of the Puerto Rican independence movement, which regularly polls 3 or 4 percent in referendums on whether the islanders want to cut their ties with Uncle Sam.

Some while back, Indonesia for some reason—I forget what—pulled out of the U.N. altogether, and stayed out for several years. Switzerland has never bothered to join. Yet the sun rises quite regularly over these lovely lands, and life goes on. South Africa would do well to consider their example.

Of course I realize that it is useful, both to South Africa and to its noisy tormentors in the U.N., to have a comfortable lounge or bar where certain little—shall we say?—arrangements can be entered into, even while the yakking is still going on in the General Assembly upstairs. But is that really worth the appearance of importance that South Africa, by seeming to care about the U.N., confers on its antics? I seriously doubt it.

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch,  
Nov. 16, 1974]

#### DECLINE OF THE UN (By Jeffrey Hart)

The United Nations—an armed citadel in its New York headquarters since it invited Yasir Arafat and the Palestine Liberation Organization to participate in the General Assembly debate on Palestine—at one time was a supreme touchstone of political virtue in the United States. It sometimes seemed as if decency itself required reverence for the UN as if only retrograde types attacked it. But, to quote John Milton, "Oh how fallen, how changed . . ." The UN may indeed confine for awhile to occupy its luxurious premises by the East River in Manhattan. Its

valued technical services may continue. But the General Assembly, that erstwhile parliament of man, has lost most of its political and all of its moral luster.

The sudden decline began around 1960. At that time, Third World nations gained a majority in the General Assembly and began passing resolutions against the West in general and against Israel in particular. From that moment on, the UN ceased to be a sacred object in American political life.

It was indeed a spectacular falling-off. During the decade following World War II, public references to the UN as "the last best hope of man" were virtually obligatory for American politicians and publicists. All this transcended partisanship. Dwight Eisenhower and Adlai Stevenson, Richard Nixon and John Kennedy competed with one another in their paeans to the UN. People like Chester Bowles, Christian Herter and Norman Cousins led the choir in assorted hymns.

#### CAME THE DESCENT

But then the curtain descended. If the UN is mentioned in either the Democratic or the Republican platform in 1976, I would be much surprised.

Since the early 1960s, the UN General Assembly has pretended to us a virtual Rake's Progress of political degeneration. Recent lopsided votes on the Palestine Liberation Organization, on the expulsion of South Africa and Taiwan, may make the front pages but they hardly exhaust the tale of absurdity.

Not that many people are aware for example that last year's General Assembly approved by a vote of 105-5, a real squeaker, a report of its Committee on Colonialism demanding independence for Puerto Rico. There exists no sign, however, that any such position has much support in . . . Puerto Rico.

In the 1972 Puerto Rican elections, the Independence Party, advocating dependence, received a thundering 4 per cent of the vote. The other parties, none of them for independence got the other 96. Unlike most of the nations voting on the questions in the UN, Puerto Rico actually holds free elections, has a free press, rights of assembly, organization and so on. The sole effect of the UN vote was to give a spurious legitimacy to the small terrorist faction now launching an international campaign for Puerto Rican Independence, and claiming responsibility for setting off five powerful bomb blasts in New York on October 27. The General Assembly is thus functioning as a catalyst for violence on the part of a tiny faction.

On September 30, the General Assembly voted 98 to 23 against seating the South African delegation, the U.S. voting No. Now, it does not escape notice that of those voting against seating South Africa, many of them were the same people who used to argue that the UN had to admit China since it "existed," and since it was better to include nations than to exclude them. It would take a poet with the skills of Dante to give adequate characterization to the hypocrisy prevailing in the UN.

If more American citizens could actually pay a visit to the auditorium in which the General Assembly holds its conclaves, well, consciousness would be raised. After an hour there, you develop an irresistible urge to take a shower, a moral sensation that somehow translates itself into a physical one. Soviet delegates arise, stride to the podium, and deliver solemn orations on the desirability of "cultural freedom" and "human rights." Much applause. African delegates, from places where racial warfare is unremitting, arise to denounce racial prejudice. When a delegate tires of this, he can always go on an anti-American rhetorical rampage.

#### ABOUT TIME

It is certainly high time that the last shreds of moral legitimacy be withdrawn

from this body. Fortunately, the method is simple, and would not at all affect the technical agencies of the UN, which do perform valuable service. It would not even affect the General Assembly as a "forum," for whatever limited value it has as such.

If the United States announced that, henceforth, its delegate would no longer vote in the General Assembly, that body would lose whatever resonance it still possesses. By participating in these votes, we almost single-handedly endow them with what legitimacy they retain.

By participating in a vote on Puerto Rican independence or on the expulsion of South Africa, we suggest that places like Uganda, Albania, Togo, and Chad have a legitimate voice of some sort in the determination of our foreign policies and the disposition of our national interest.

The UN General Assembly has become a farce, a moral affront, and, to the extent that it is still taken seriously, it has become a menace. We should continue to sit there, and participate in its debates. But when the voting commences, we should not vote yes or no, and we should not abstain. We should register as "not voting." That, I think, would do it.

As a fine alternative, we should embrace the suggestion of President Idi Amin of Uganda that the UN move permanently to his country.

[From the Star-News, Nov. 19, 1974]

#### THE UNITED NATIONS FARE (By Vic Gold)

Much like the Watergate revelations, the depths of legal and moral idiocy to which the U.N. General Assembly is capable of descending seem bottomless.

Thus, in one typical U.N. week, South Africa is suspended from participation, while Yasir Arafat, complete with pistol, is exalted at the podium of world peace and understanding.

Once the U.N.'s detractors spoke disparagingly of the General Assembly as "a mere debating society." In the fullness of time, that line has proved to be an undeserved aspersion on mere debating societies.

For all their shortcomings, it can be said of debating societies that they abide by single-standard rules of civilized discourse. No self-respecting society—or should we say, no society deserving respect—would simultaneously exclude a legitimate member from its premises and provide a platform for a non-member whose credentials for entry include the indiscriminate use of terror to make a point.

There was also a time, in the not-too-distant past, when the standard rhetoric of the liberal establishment glowingly described the U.N. as "the world's last best hope for peace." Significantly, that phrase hasn't been heard much in recent years. Small comfort: Even the bloated rhetoric of utopian liberalism has its limits.

Not, however, the double-standard rhetoric of the U.N. General Assembly.

Consider the assembly's dual handiwork last week. First, that suspension of the South African delegation from the current session on grounds specifically prohibited by terms of the U.N. Charter, i.e., the application of standards for entry which constitute interference in the domestic affairs of a member state.

Then, having pronounced moral judgment on South Africa, members of the assembly majority—which, of course, include nations that countenance slavery in both its ancient and modern totalitarian forms—went on to greet Arafat, the gun-carrying terrorist leader, as one report had it, "like a conquering hero."

Indeed, back-to-back within a single week's span, Pretoria's suspension and the PLO leader's exaltation represented a new low in

December 2, 1974

General Assembly irresponsibility. Though not, let me predict, the ultimate low as far as the interests of the United States are concerned.

That should come anywhere in three to ten sessions from now, when the same assembly majority votes to suspend the U.S. delegation on grounds of racial discrimination and repression in our domestic affairs—as such matters are uniquely viewed and defined by the adulators of Yasir Arafat.

An outlandish prospect? Not at all. In fact, given current trends, a likely one.

The precedent for arbitrary and capricious suspension having been established in the South African case, what in the world—in the Third World, if you will—should inhibit the legal and moral idiots who comprise the assembly majority from applying the same standards to this country?

Oh no, you say. They wouldn't dare. After all, the United States is the U.N.'s single largest financial patron, and we wouldn't put up with it. We'd cut off their funds. Ask them to pack up and leave. They know that.

But then, considering the acquiescence of the U.S. delegation to last week's developments, why should they?

[From the Wall Street Journal, Nov. 20, 1974]

#### TERRORISM AND THE UN

Word is finally getting out that some nations, Israel and South Africa among them, can't get a fair trial at the United Nations. The current General Assembly President, Algerian Foreign Minister Abdelaziz Bouteflika, has been criticized for a series of one-sided rulings last week, notably the suspension of South Africa from the Assembly, limitations on Israel's right to speak in the "Palestine Question" debate, and the awarding of head-of-state honors to Palestine guerrilla chief Yasir Arafat.

We, on the contrary, feel some sense of gratitude of Mr. Bouteflika. He is single-handedly dramatizing the extent to which the UN's original high hopes and purposes have been compromised. And a realistic view of the UN's limitations is vital to American policy.

The dashing 39-year-old Mr. Bouteflika personifies the Arab-African coalition in the General Assembly. Thanks to a combination of oil money and Third World moral suasion, this bloc delivers at least 70 votes in that 138-member body on almost anything that strikes its fancy. Most of these recent decisions were probably illegal by international law and UN procedure, but that is just quibbling. The important point is the major constitutional change this bloc has brought about in the U.N. It has produced a new sort of bicameral hypocrisy.

In the process, the General Assembly is changing the definition of a phenomenon the rest of us persist in calling "terrorism." Mr. Arafat knew his audience at the UN, and we are grateful to him, too, for spelling out just what was going on. "The difference between the revolutionary and the terrorist," he said, "lies in the reason for which each fights. For whoever stands by a just cause and fights for the freedom and liberation of his land from the invaders, the settlers and the colonialists, cannot possibly be called terrorist. . . . Many of you who are here in the Assembly Hall were considered terrorists."

By reasoning current at the UN, the very fact a "settler-colonial regime" exists amounts to aggression and oppression, and therefore anything it does is the real terrorism.

But "national liberation movements" fight in self-defense and therefore have carte blanche to struggle "by any means at their disposal" (to quote a General Assembly resolution of November 30, 1970). This language is in the draft of the Palestine resolution that the Arab countries will most likely ask the General Assembly to adopt at the end of this week.

Some Western diplomats may argue halfheartedly that such struggle would be limited by the principles of the United Nations, but the Palestinians have already answered that. In yesterday morning's attack on Beit Shean, the guerrillas showed that their right to struggle includes the attempt to take hostages in civilian apartment buildings. This sort of incident used to be considered beyond the pale, but we are confident that in the course of this week's General Assembly debate, the marvelously flexible Third World logic will manage to read it into the UN charter.

The end result will be to show for all to see that the UN has forsaken its early, noble ambitions to be an instrument of peace and has chosen instead to embrace the foulest means of political struggle. Its already demoralized bureaucracy will not be able to conceal that fact from the world at large and this in turn could have serious consequences for some of the technical work it performs—through the Food and Agriculture Organization and World Health Organization, for example—which does have value.

This is a chastening outcome for the United States, which did so much to bring the institution into being. The UN expresses hopes important to mankind, hopes of a universal world body, devoted to peaceful settlement of disputes. Even though these high hopes have never been met in the body's history, their power has enabled the U.S. to use the UN as an instrument of largely positive policies. But with the UN itself flouting its principles, denying universal membership, and sanctioning violence for "correct" purposes, any constructive use becomes increasingly doubtful.

The U.S. is contributing nearly \$60 million to the current UN budget, some 25% of the total. It might be time to consider in all seriousness whether this money would be better spent buying food for starving Third World masses. If the General Assembly is going to abandon peacekeeping and support terrorism there is no reason why it should do so on a U.S. allowance.

[From the Richmond News Leader,  
Nov. 18, 1974]

#### THE BARREL OF A GUN

The Palestine Liberation Organization subscribes to Chairman Mao's dictum that power comes from the barrel of a gun. Perhaps the PLO is correct.

First, the Arab states decreed that the PLO should speak at the United Nations for the Palestinian people. Then the UN General Assembly invited Yasir Arafat, leader of the PLO, to present the Palestinian case. So it goes at the UN, where a few years back delegates debated ways to counter terrorism. Now they have elected to reward it. Collecting that reward was the unlikely Arafat—a plump opportunist whom no one took seriously a decade ago.

Emotions ran high when Arafat addressed the General Assembly. Supporters of Israel turned out massively in New York. Surely President Ford and congressional leaders in Washington received the message: Israel is not entirely alone in the world.

Arafat's odd, theatrical performance was designed to give the impression of moderation. To believe him, one must believe that the PLO is simply an altruistic body devoted to the brotherhood of man. But Yasir giveth, and Yasir taketh away: "I come bearing an olive branch and a gun. Do not let the olive branch fall from my hand. Do not let the olive branch fall from my hand." Which is to say that the olive branch may fall from his hand, and the gun will not.

Other Arafat statements are equally stern stuff. He has come close to predicting war with Israel on several occasions. And, in a revealing interview with Oriana Fallaci, published last week in *The New Republic*, he said:

This war has just started. We are just beginning to get ready for what will be a long, long war, a war that will run for generations. . . . What you should have asked is: How long can the Israeli go on? We shall never stop until we can go back home and Israel is destroyed. The alliance of the Arab world will make this possible. We don't want peace, we want victory. Peace for us means Israel's destruction and nothing else. What you call peace is peace for Israel, and for the imperialists. For us it is shame and injustice. We shall fight on to victory. Even for decades, for generations if necessary.

That is hardly the statement of a man who lives by the olive branch. But Arafat's diatribe does get at the nub of the problem—the problem of land. The Palestinians believe that with the connivance of a West consumed with guilt because of the Nazi holocaust, the Israelis stole their land. Claims to the land which now is Israel date back to biblical times, and the claims are complicated. Yet the Israeli claim is as good as any.

Arafat's reception at the UN tightens the pressure on Israel. Arabs comprise 3 percent of the world's population. They possess 16 percent of the votes in the UN General Assembly, and they have access to many more. They inhabit 15 percent of the earth's surface, control 80 percent of the world's known oil reserves, and sit on a seemingly unlimited supply of cash. That oil and that money have shifted the balance of world diplomacy against Israel, and the possibility that she will be ejected from the UN grows stronger each day.

The economic strain of maintaining the Israeli citizen-army is tremendous. Yet that army stands strong—and motivated. Those who underestimate Israel will do so at their peril. So perhaps the heroes of Munich and Maalot must learn again—and again, and again—that power does indeed come from the barrel of a gun.

[From the Northern Virginia Daily,  
Nov. 20, 1974]

#### BASTARDIZING THE U.N. CHARTER

In a recent issue of his Washington "Exclusive," Fulton Lewis III made this assertion: "The United Nations has sunk to new depths of irresponsibility." Throughout its 29-year history, Mr. Lewis said, the UN has shown itself to be an "irresponsible, farcical, pathetically inept and morally bankrupt organization, which deserves neither our respect nor our financial support."

Whatever the UN started out to be—and no one questions its lofty purposes—the organization soon got bogged down in a morass of inconsistent, self-serving political maneuvers by which individual member states denied justice in favor of nationalistic opportunism.

The list is long and can be documented. Outstanding among the UN's non-successes was the rape of Hungary in 1956, when the troops of Soviet Russia invaded Hungary on a massive scale to enforce on her a government completely subservient to the Kremlin. The UN did nothing while the sovereignty of a member state was violated by another member state.

The invasion of Czechoslovakia by Soviet troops in 1968, to crush a move toward democratic liberalization by the Czech government, was a more recent example of UN ineptitude. Again, the UN stood by and did nothing.

The UN Security Council ruling in late 1966 which branded the little African nation of Rhodesia "a threat to world peace" was utterly ridiculous.

The action, in 1971, in which Nationalist China (one of the UN's founding nations) was ousted from UN membership, at the time Communist China was accepted, was another blot on the UN's tarnished record for which there was no valid justification.

The UN Charter limits membership to

December 2, 1974

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 20345

"peace-loving nations." It must have been difficult, even for the most insouciant nations, to reconcile this blatant favoritism in accepting Peking's membership after having just prior to that labeled Red China an "international outlaw."

Just several weeks ago the UN added a new laurel to its non-illustrious record when the General Assembly overrode a Security Council veto to bar South Africa from exercising a member's right to speak in General Assembly debate and to vote in the Assembly or its committees. The reason: because a group of newly emerged black African nations, supported by the Arab nations, disapproved of the South African policy of apartheid.

This brings us up to the UN's crowning achievement of last week centered around the appearance of the Palestinian leader Yasir Arafat.

We felt that the appearance of Arafat before the General Assembly was justified because, insofar as the Arab world is concerned, he is the spokesman for the Palestinian Liberation Organization, which in turn presumes to speak for the several million Palestinians in the Mideast.

The world cannot continue to sweep the Palestinian question under the rug. It is a key point in any Mideast solution. This being the case, if a lasting peace in the Mideast is the universal objective, it would seem that a UN forum was the proper place to hear all sides of the matter.

It was not the fact that Arafat was invited to present the Palestinian side that we found objectionable. Where else could it be more effectively done than a UN forum?

What did bother us was the obsequious, ingratiating treatment given this revolutionary by UN officials. Arafat received all of the pomp and circumstance usually reserved for heads of state.

But, so far as we know, no head of state ever appeared before the General Assembly armed, as did Arafat, who arrived attired in his traditional Arab headdress and around his waist a holstered pistol.

His appearance, which in his own words symbolized "bearing an olive branch and a freedom fighter's gun," was hardly the fitting approach to peace-loving nations, and was an inappropriate arrogance which under normal circumstances should be enough to turn off possible converts.

But, if this show of insolent haughtiness ruffled the feathers of UN officialdom we have heard nothing about it.

The Arafat confrontation turned out to be an unfortunate violation of appropriate decorum on his part. We hope that if the PLO leader is invited back again he will be told to leave his guns at home.

At some point, the antics of the UN must be weighed by the responsible, "peace-loving" members such as the U.S. All too often what occurs in the UN General Assembly constitutes an embarrassment to the U.S., sometimes amounting almost to an affront to our national dignity.

And, for this we ante-up 40 percent of the UN budget each year.

[From the Hearst newspapers,  
Nov. 17, 1974]

## A TRIUMPH FOR TERROR

(By William Randolph Hearst)

New York.—The formally invited appearance of Yasir Arafat before the United Nations General Assembly this week was a nauseating spectacle for all of us who can recall the lofty ideals proclaimed in San Francisco when the world organization was founded there nearly 30 years ago.

One picture summed up the whole sickening scene here last Wednesday. It was the picture of Arafat, top emissary of Middle East terrorism, clasping his hands above his head like a triumphant pugilist while a ma-

jority of the General Assembly delegates gave him a standing ovation.

It was indeed a moment of historic triumph for the sinister man recently selected by the Arab countries as official national spokesman for the Palestinian refugees. It also was a new low in shame for the UN, whose every precept of peace through reasonable dialogue had notoriously been violated by its murderous guest.

Arafat's lengthy speech before the UN was hailed in some quarters as surprisingly low-key and moderate. In some ways it was. He didn't, after all, blow up any planes at Kennedy Airport, nor kidnap and hold for ransom anybody while he was in town, nor call for the complete destruction of Israel—the original aim of the Fedayeen in his Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO).

No, not that. All he demanded was Israel's replacement by a Palestine state in which Moslems, Jews and Christians theoretically would live happily together under his concept of Arab justice. He was deliberately vague on how this outrageously impossible idea might be realized. Nevertheless it was applauded by his supporters as a statesmanlike pronouncement.

Arafat, his pudgy cheeks shaved for a change, obviously agreed with them. What he was holding in one hand, he said, was "an olive branch." With unbelievable audacity, he pictured his proposal as a kind of noble concession.

The true colors of the terrorist leader, however, were simultaneously revealed. He gave a grim warning of intensified guerrilla horrors by declaring that in his other hand he held a "freedom fighter's gun." "Do not let the olive branch fail," he said ominously.

Close-up photographs later revealed that the speaker was, indeed, wearing a holster on his belt which may or may not have held a pistol. His aides claimed variously that he was unarmed or that the holster was for his familiar dark glasses. Photographers at the scene insisted they knew a pistol holder when they saw one, however fleetingly.

Whether he was tugging a pistol when addressing what is supposed to be a world peace organization really is immaterial. The consummate gall inherent in his speech proved he is fully capable of such an act.

Some statesmanship! Some moderation! Arafat in actuality called for what would amount to the dissolution of Israel, whose existence was created and guaranteed by the UN—a point underscored in the icy rebuttal speech by the Israeli chief delegate, Yosef Tekoah. Never, said Tekoah, would Israel permit the establishment of PLO authority in any part of Palestine.

It was like the celebrated case of an irresistible force colliding head on with an immovable body, and Arafat obviously had anticipated this. In his speech he foresaw the looming possibility of a fifth Middle East war, which he said could end in nuclear destruction.

More to the point and significantly revealing what the UN has become, the terrorist leader hinted that Israel may well be suspended from UN membership—as South Africa was earlier in the week by a 91-22 vote in the General Assembly.

And thereby hangs a tale whose telling is crucial if the degeneration of the UN is to be understood fully. When the UN was founded its General Assembly was formed of countries supposedly all dedicated to the same principles of humanitarian cooperation. Each member, regardless of size, was given an equal vote.

Today the General Assembly has 138 member nations. More and more, over the years, gang-ups by smaller and underdeveloped countries of the so-called Third World have been forcing actions which serve purely personal interests by combining their voting strength—even when some such actions not

only violate UN ideals but its operational rules.

That is what happened this week when the African bloc, justifiably angry at South Africa's continuing Apartheid racial injustice, finally succeeded in effectively barring that country from UN participation by a tricky circumvention of the rules. In exchange for Arab bloc support, the Africans on Wednesday rose to cheer and applaud Arafat.

Today's UN General Assembly, in point of fact, is being largely run for the special interests of the Third World bloc. This means, bluntly, that the developed nations which originally conceived and largely support the UN financially, can be and often are at the mercy of the underdeveloped and irresponsible.

The Arafat UN spectacle, conceivably, might be viewed as a nightmare joke showing how far the world organization has been led astray by its preponderance of small countries jealous of the big power democracies.

It could—if the current events weren't so tragically serious and threatening to world stability. At the very least, all the painfully achieved progress by Secretary of State Kissinger toward compromise in the Mideast has been thrown out of kilter and an indignant Israel rendered more suspicious, wary and more politically united than ever.

Most important is the new kind of shame the UN has heaped upon itself. By inviting Yasir Arafat to speak with all the trappings of a head of state, the UN in effect put the stamp of its international approval on terrorism.

The sickening prestige accorded to Arafat inevitably and automatically has placed world peace in grave new peril.

Personally, I am just about fed up with the entire UN organization. It is simply too much when a guerrilla goon like Arafat, who has no formal standing in the UN whatever, can get up before the body and confidently threaten to have it oust a veteran member if it doesn't bow to his ultimatums.

When bunches of Third World nations with no regard for the legally drawn charter gang up and start purging properly admitted UN members because they don't like their domestic policies—then a reassessment of General Assembly voting power and procedures is due.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement that I made on the floor of the Senate on June 8, 1973, dealing with the United Nations, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

## LEGAL IMPORTATION OF CHROME AND NICKEL FROM RHODESIA

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, the press reports today that the United States Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. John H. Scali, stated yesterday that the United States is in "open violation of international law" in allowing the importation of Rhodesian chrome and nickel.

Mr. President, I think that perhaps Ambassador Scali has been affected by the rarefied atmosphere of the penthouse apartment he has in the Waldorf Towers in New York City.

Mr. Scali went on, according to the news report, to say that because the United Nations Security Council resolution in 1966 had ordered an economic boycott of Rhodesia it was "legally binding on the United States."

Mr. President, let us explore that a little bit. The United Nations did decree sanctions against Rhodesia.

The President of the United States at that time, Lyndon B. Johnson, in 1967, acting on his own, without consultation with Congress,

put into effect economic sanctions against that nation. The economic sanctions are in effect today, with one exception: the Congress of the United States adopted legislation which stated that the importation of a strategic material from a non-Communist country could not be denied if the same strategic material was being imported from a Communist country.

That legislation passed the Senate of the United States. It passed the House of Representatives. It was approved by the Congress of the United States, it was signed into law by the President of the United States. There has been a court test brought by various Members of the House of Representatives, seeking to have that law nullified. The courts have upheld what the Congress of the United States did.

So, Congress, acting on a matter affecting our own national interest, and taking the steps prescribed under the Constitution, enacted legislation which is now a part of the law of our Nation.

One would think that the American Ambassador to the United Nations would feel an obligation to support the laws of our Nation. One would think the Ambassador to the United Nations would have an obligation to support the duly enacted laws—laws enacted by Congress, signed by the President, and approved by the courts. But now we find him making speeches in New York, saying that the U.S. Congress acted illegally. Nonsense.

Yes, I think Mr. Scall has been affected by the rarefied atmosphere of that magnificent penthouse apartment that the Government of the United States furnishes him in the Waldorf Towers in New York City.

It is interesting to note that the taxpayers of the United States pay a rent of \$38,000 a year for that apartment in the Waldorf, for the American Ambassador to live there. Well, we want the American Ambassador to have good quarters. But we do not want him to be affected by the rarefied atmosphere that he finds himself in when he gets into such luxurious and sumptuous quarters.

He says the Security Council decision is legally binding on the United States. What he is saying is that the U.S. Congress must subordinate itself to any acts taken by the Security Council of the United Nations.

He must know that that is not correct. If he does not know it is not correct, he should read the laws and understand the Constitution of our Nation.

Congress did not turn over to the United Nations the right to determine what laws Congress can and cannot make. Yes, I think the American Ambassador to the United Nations should represent the people of the United States and uphold the laws of the United States while he is an Ambassador, rather than inaccurately to condemn Congress and condemn the President, who signed the bill into law.

Another aspect worth considering is that the legislation which the American Ambassador, Mr. Scall, condemns was approved by Members of Congress from 46 of the 50 States. Senators and Representatives from 46 of the 50 States taken together supported the legislation which Ambassador Scall says is illegal. Congress did not turn over to Ambassador Scall the determination of what is legal and what is illegal.

I happen to be a supporter of the United Nations. I returned to San Francisco in 1945, when the United Nations was being formed. I came back from the Pacific—Okinawa—as a naval officer. I held high hopes that the world organization being formed in 1945 in San Francisco would bring about world peace.

Things have changed greatly since then. At that time 51 nations were members of the United Nations, all of them having a long history of established government. Now 132 nations are members, most of them having

had very little experience in self-government, and very few of them being in a position to attempt to tell the rest of the nations of the world how to handle their own problems.

Be that as it may, it is discouraging to me when the American Ambassador to the United Nations makes a public speech in New York, saying that Congress acted illegally in passing legislation affecting its own domestic problems, its own domestic needs.

The first obligation of the Congress of the United States is to the people of the United States. The first obligation of our Ambassador to the United Nations is to support the laws of the United States.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a speech that I made in the Senate on June 14, 1973, be printed in the Record.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

#### SANCTIONS AGAINST RHODESIA

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, on June 7, in New York City, Ambassador John Scall, U.S. Representative to the United Nations, delivered an address. This address was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Wednesday, June 13, at the request of the distinguished senior Senator from Wyoming (Mr. McGEE).

The address of Ambassador Scall dealt with the United Nations. It was delivered before an audience of persons interested in the world organization. I have read this address carefully. With the exception of two or three paragraphs, it is a speech that I could comfortably have delivered myself.

Mr. Scall in the course of his remarks stated that as a newly returned young war correspondent, he got back to the United States about the time that the United Nations was formed in San Francisco in 1945.

I had a similar experience as a young naval officer. I returned from Okinawa to San Francisco at the time the United Nations Conference there was in progress. So both of us developed an early interest in this world organization—an interest that both of us have kept through the years.

Then Mr. Scall says:

"It is a truism to say that the world community, and particularly the American people, have been disappointed in the achievements of the United Nations thus far."

I concur in that view. I must say that I have been disappointed in the achievements of the United Nations, just as Ambassador Scall indicates that he has been disappointed.

Overall, I think it is a good speech. It is a careful, well-written address, and very sincere. The aspect of it with which I do not agree consists of only two paragraphs—with the rest of the speech I am in full agreement—wherein Ambassador Scall attacks the Congress of the United States because of legislation which the Congress passed 2 years ago.

The legislation under attack by Ambassador Scall permits the importation of chrome from Rhodesia under certain conditions, and in so doing it sets aside the embargo placed on trade with Rhodesia insofar as the importation of chrome is concerned.

Mr. Scall is careless with his facts. He says:

"At that time, nearly two years ago, Congress passed legislation making it impossible—"

I am reading from his speech—

"for the executive branch to prevent importation of chrome and other strategic commodities from Rhodesia, as required by the Security Council."

Mr. Scall is not factually correct. He is incorrect. The legislation did not make it impossible for the executive branch to prevent importation from Rhodesia.

What the legislation did say—and I would suggest that Ambassador Scall get a copy of

it and read it—is that the importation of chrome from a Free World country cannot be prohibited if that same strategic material is being imported from a Communist-dominated country, in this case Russia.

So if the President of the United States does not want to have chrome imported from Rhodesia, he can stop the importation of chrome from Russia. In that case, the law which Congress passed would not be effective. So there is a way, if the President of the United States so desires, that the importation of this strategic material from Rhodesia can be prevented.

That is a relatively minor point. That is not the reason why I am calling attention to Ambassador Scall's speech today. I think he ought to get his facts straight.

But that is not the principal reason I am taking the floor. The reason I am taking the floor today is this: He says that the action of the Security Council of the United Nations is legally binding on the United States. He condemns Congress for doing what he says is in open violation of international law. Let us see first what is this open violation of international law.

Congress taking note of the embargo put on trade with Rhodesia, and noting that the bulk of the world's chrome supply is in Rhodesia, and noting as a result of the embargo the United States was forced to rely on Communist Russia for a majority of its chrome imports, passed legislation which states that the President cannot prohibit the importation of strategic material from a non-Communist country if the same material is being imported from a Communist country.

Yet the Ambassador to the United Nations says that the Congress acted illegally. He is wrong. Our Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. John Scall, says that the position of the Security Council in regard to the embargo on trade with Rhodesia "is legally binding on the United States." Nonsense.

Has Congress abdicated its right to pass laws for the benefit of the people of America, and given that right to the United Nations in New York? Ambassador Scall thinks so. But the Senator from Virginia does not think so.

I know an effort will be made again to repeal what Congress passed 2 years ago. There are Members of Congress who take the same view as does Ambassador Scall—that whatever the world organization in New York says, whatever the Security Council says, is binding on the United States. I disagree.

Mr. Scall, in the earlier part of his speech—and, as I say, I am in agreement with virtually all of his speech except for two paragraphs—says, speaking of the United Nations, that—

"We did not create an instant world government. Instead, what we put in place was an international forum."

He says that we do not have a world government; we have an international forum; and that that international forum can dictate to Congress; and if Congress goes contrary to action taken by the Security Council, it is going contrary to something that is legally binding on the United States. I submit that Mr. Scall is just as wrong as he can be.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I yield to the distinguished Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it was my privilege to serve for at least one brief period as a delegate to the United Nations. I came away with this conclusion: That the sooner we in Congress and the American people recognize the United Nations to be exactly what everybody else on God's green Earth believes it to be, the better off everybody, including ourselves, will be. What the United Nations really is, is clearly a debating society. To pretend that it is something else is to mislead oneself.

People generally follow what the United



December 2, 1974

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 20347

Nations recommends if they find it to their advantage, otherwise they ignore it. When the United Nations recommends that people do something, they will be prevailed upon to do it, even though they may not be inclined to do so, because the United States might offer them the advantage of a trade concession or offer to do something that they want us to do in other respects. But the idea that the United Nations has this great power to move the world in one direction or the other is not shared by the rest of the world. They use it only when they find it to their advantage to use it for their own interests.

The United States, I suppose, is the only nation on Earth that permits the United Nations, this international debating society, to use the United States. My only regret is that I was not permitted to vote to decline to finance any more activities of the United Nations. So, I should like to make it clear that my vote in the State Department appropriation bill we just passed today was dictated by other things that were in the bill. If it had been purely a \$200 million appropriation for the United Nations, I would have said it was not worth \$2, that if we were interested in seeing something going on, we could find something more interesting than the United Nations and we should go somewhere else.

If Mr. Scall thinks that the other nations of the world respect a resolution of the Security Council of the United Nations or of the General Assembly as being international law binding on them, I would invite him to go around the world and find out how many nations do regard it as being international law binding upon them. I think that he will find this organization has more respect in the United States—which pays most of its expenses, provides it with a home, and sponsored the idea to begin with—than anywhere else on earth.

Any respect the United Nations enjoys among the American people has declined drastically year by year to the point where I would think its impotence, its effectiveness, and its ability to do that for which it was organized in the first instance has declined to the point where a lot of us, who had such high hopes, now feel we would be better off if we dissolved that outfit and put something else in to take its place, to do that which the United Nations was organized to do to begin with.

But in spite of the efforts of those who did not agree with the objectives of the United Nations, such as the Communist blocs, which prevented that organization from being what it could have been, which many of us hoped that it would be, we joined in seeking to promote peace, in working together for the good of the world, and to strengthen world government rather than to undermine and destroy it. So that the purpose of the United Nations has been so completely negated by those who did not share that desire, it has probably become as much of an impediment to achieving what it was organized to do as it has been an asset for that purpose.

So, if Mr. Scall has not become aware of what the United Nations really is, what the rest of the world knows it to be, I would invite him to take a trip around the world and find out for himself whether the other nations of the world regard a United Nations resolution as being international law binding on them.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Yes, and I would be interested, too, to know how many Members of the Congress of the United States feel that their votes are bound by what the United Nations Security Council does, and how many Members of the Congress of the United States feel that they cannot pass legislation here, affecting the United States of America and the inhabitants thereof, if such legislation goes counter to something that the United Nations Security Council in New York has dictated.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President, it was my experience that much of the time we spent at the United Nations was a very frustrating experience and could have been much better spent somewhere else. I would think that Mr. Scall would be well advised to spend some of his time reading the speech of the distinguished Senator from Virginia (Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR.). He would find it to be a far better investment of his time and energy than in observing and entering into the activities that occur at the United Nations.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I thank the distinguished Senator from Louisiana for his comments. In connection with his comments, let me say that the United Nations has changed a great deal since 1945 when it was first organized. At that time, there were 51 members, all of whom had a long record of government—in many cases self-government, but in any case a long record of government.

Now there are 122 nations who are members, and few of the new ones have any record of government. There is very little education in those nations. They are small, which is no fault of theirs, of course, but in many cases they lack the experience with government even to govern themselves effectively. Many of them, however, are not only telling the world how to govern itself, but are telling the United States how to govern itself.

Yet our Ambassador to the United Nations, who is supposed to represent the laws of the United States, says that the U.S. Congress is acting illegally, that we are bound—the Senator from Louisiana, the Senator from West Virginia, the Senator from Oklahoma, the Senator from Virginia—by some action that the Security Council in New York takes.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Virginia yield to me, since he has referred to me?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I am happy to yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. When I was elected to this body, and each time I have been re-elected, I have had to take an oath upon entering the office of U.S. Senator to uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States. I did that gladly and willingly and I would not have it any other way. But I have never yet taken an oath to uphold a constitution of the United Nations. That has not been required of me. I am not so sure that I would take such an oath.

I am not wholly against the United Nations. I think it has done some good. But I am not in agreement with many of its actions. It is a weak vessel. But, that is not the point.

My first allegiance is to the United States of America. On the other hand, my allegiance—if I have any—to the United Nations is somewhere way, way, way down the line.

Now, insofar as U.N. sanctions against Rhodesia are concerned, I should like to ask the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia whether he believes Rhodesia, in any way, constitutes a threat to the peace and security of the world.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. By no stretch of anyone's imagination do I see how it could possibly be construed as a threat to the peace of the world.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Has Rhodesia, in any of its actions that the distinguished Senator from Virginia can remember, offended or threatened the security of the United States of America? Has it taken any action with respect to trade with the United States or against the good name of the United States that would be offensive to this country?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Are there any United Nations sanctions against trading with the

Soviet Union—a country which is feared by much of the free world and which on many occasions has threatened the peace and security of other countries, including our own?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. There are no sanctions against trading with the Soviet Union. There were no sanctions against trading with North Vietnam at the time North Vietnam was killing 50,000 Americans and wounding 300,000 others.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Are there any United Nations sanctions against trading with the People's Republic of China—a government which contributed to the killing of Americans and allies in Vietnam?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. There are no sanctions whatsoever.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Then why are there sanctions against trading with Rhodesia?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I cannot understand why there should be. The principal reason seems to be that Rhodesia is seeking to do what the United States did almost 200 years ago; namely, to declare her independence from Great Britain. Whether she should be a part of Great Britain or independent of Great Britain, I do not think is for us in the Senate of the United States to say. Whatever she wants to do is all right with me, or whatever they want to do between them is all right with me.

But I do not want to see our country institute sanctions against another country because that country seeks her independence from the same country from which we sought our independence in 1776.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Does the Senator feel that the United States has been largely persuaded in this venture by virtue of its allegiance to and warm friendship with Great Britain?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Certainly, our delegates to the United Nations followed closely the recommendations, the suggestions, and the views of Great Britain.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Did our friends in Great Britain apply sanctions against trading with North Vietnam during the years North Vietnam was killing American fighting men in South Vietnam?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. No, Great Britain did not apply sanctions against North Vietnam. More than that, Great Britain permitted ships flying her flag to carry cargo to North Vietnam at a time when the United States was heavily engaged in military activity in that area.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. In other words Great Britain had no compunctions against trading with our enemy at a time when our enemy was killing American fighting men. But, at the same time, we went along with Great Britain in applying sanctions against a little country that was not killing American fighting men, a country with which we were not and are not at war, and a country that did not then and does not now constitute a threat to the peace and security of our own country or of Great Britain or of the world. Is that a fair statement to make?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I think that is a very fair statement, a perfectly fair statement.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. May I say to the distinguished senior Senator from Virginia that he does not stand alone in this matter, although he has been alone in taking the floor here from time to time to speak on the subject. I have been willing to just to listen, because I felt that I could learn. But I assure him that I stand with him in this matter; and if the votes of the Senate upon several occasions are to be taken as any indication of the overall sentiment of the Senate, he knows that he has considerable company here with him. I hope he will continue to take the position he is taking. I, for one, will continue to stand by his side on this issue.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I am very grateful

S 20348

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

December 2, 1974

to my close friend, the Senator from West Virginia. There is no one with whom I would rather stand side by side than the able and distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD). I am grateful for his remarks.

The point that the able Senator from West Virginia raised, as to whether Rhodesia constitutes a threat to world peace, gets to the heart of the problem that the Security Council of the United Nations had to face when the decision was made to apply sanctions. Under the United Nations Charter, the only lawful right the Security Council has to demand sanctions is to make a case that a particular country is a threat to world peace.

How can anyone say that this small, landlocked country—with a very small defense force—can constitute a threat to world peace? It shows the hypocrisy of this whole thing.

I have never been to Rhodesia. I do not know many Rhodesians. I have no personal interest in this matter at all. But, as a matter of principle, I became interested in this matter in 1966 and 1967.

I think it is absolutely outrageous for this great country, the United States, to apply sanctions against a peaceful, little country which by no stretch of the imagination can be construed as a threat to world peace.

To show further the hypocrisy, it was just 2 weeks ago that the American Ambassador to the United Nations and the British representative to the United Nations vetoed in the Security Council an effort to apply sanctions to South Africa and to Portugal.

South Africa has for herself, and Portugal has for her colonies, a similar philosophy of government, one might say, insofar as the handling of certain problems in those countries is concerned, as does Rhodesia. Yet, sanctions were not applied against South Africa or Portugal, because the American and British representatives vetoed that proposal.

If our Ambassador vetoed the proposal to declare sanctions against South Africa, which he did, and if he vetoed the proposal to declare sanctions against Portugal—the Portuguese colonies of Angola and Mozambique have the racial elements that are subject to laws similar to those in Rhodesia—then, to my mind, it clearly comes down to the fact that the only reason there are sanctions against Rhodesia is that Rhodesia is trying to get her independence from Great Britain, and the United States is helping to prevent that from being done.

I think that is a matter to be determined by Great Britain and Rhodesia, a matter to be worked out between themselves.

What I am deeply concerned about is that the American Ambassador to the United Nations, Mr. John Scall, says:

"The action of the Security Council is legally binding on the United States."

He calls on Congress to change the law so that we will conform ourselves to the action taken by the Security Council of the United Nations in regard to sanctions against Rhodesia. Well, I sort of hope that issue will come up.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I yield.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Did I correctly understand the Senator to say that the actions by the Security Council of the United Nations are legally binding upon the Congress of the United States?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. In reply, let me read a sentence from the speech by Ambassador Scall:

"At that time, the Congress voted legislation making it impossible for the Executive Branch to prevent imports of chrome and other strategic commodities from Rhodesia as required by the Security Council, a decision which the United States voted and

which is legally binding on the United States."

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Notwithstanding the action of Congress to the contrary?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Notwithstanding the action of Congress, the ambassador representing the United States says that our laws must be subordinated to the decrees of the United Nations Security Council.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. This should come as an eye-opener to all Members of Congress.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I would think so.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Even those Members of Congress who may in this particular instance disagree with the position of the able senior Senator from Virginia with respect to the importation of chromium ore.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Yes.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Even though they may disagree with him on that question, I wonder how many Members of Congress would swallow this doctrine that the action of the U.N. Security Council is binding on the United States, notwithstanding the action of the Federal legislature to the contrary. That is a pretty far-reaching doctrine, in my estimation.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. What the Ambassador to the United Nations says is more far-reaching than the question of whether chrome should be imported from Rhodesia; much more important than whether there should be sanctions. He is hitting at the heart of the legislative system of the United States.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. He is not refuting what he said earlier, if I understand what the Senator read earlier—and I have great respect for Mr. Scall. I do not want the Record to misrepresent me in this respect, but I understood the able senior Senator from Virginia to say earlier that in reading the statement by Mr. Scall—

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Perhaps this was the statement:

We can see now clearly that we did not create an instant world government.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Right. Is not Mr. Scall in another part of his statement refuting what he said in that statement?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. That is right.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. He said we did not create an instant world government, but now he is saying in another part of his statement that the actions of the United Nations are superior to the actions of the U.S. Congress to the contrary; and therefore, insofar as the United States is concerned, it is in essence, a member of a world government that is supreme to the Government of the United States, as one of the components of that world government.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Yes. That is what he is arguing in the latter part of his speech. In the first part he stated:

We can see now clearly that we did not create an instant world government. Instead, what we put in place was an international forum.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Now, then, can the decisions of a mere international forum be superior to the contrary actions of the duly constituted Federal legislatures of one of the participants—to wit, the United States—in that international forum?

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. To me, it cannot, I would think regardless of how a Member of the Senate or Member of the House might stand on the question of sanctions against Rhodesia on the importation of chrome, it seems to me that all of us must stand foursquare for the principle that we cannot be bound in our deliberations here by what might be done by the Security Council of the United States in the city of New York.

If we get to the point that Ambassador Scall is arguing, I am not sure I want to remain a Member of this body, as fine a body as it is, and as fine a group of men as it is. I am going to vote for the best interests of the peo-

ple of the United States. As the Senator from West Virginia said, he took an oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States and his obligation is to the United States and the people of the States.

Mr. Scall pointed out that the United States has not created a world government. Ambassador Scall makes that clear in his own statement. If we have not gone into a world government, how can an international forum, as he calls it, decree laws for the United States and dictate to the Congress of the United States what is and what is not legally binding on it?

I know a lot of people in Congress want to give more power to the President, whoever he might be; many people in Congress want to give more power to the United Nations; and some in Congress are not particularly concerned how they use their responsibility and they are perfectly willing to give away the prerogatives and let someone else assume the responsibility.

However, how many Members of the Senate and how many Members of the House of Representatives agree with Ambassador Scall that if the Security Council votes a certain action, that that action is binding on the Congress of the United States? I would like to see a rollcall on that, if there is any way to bring it about. I just do not believe that the men who are sitting in this Chamber and the men sitting in the Chamber across the hall, the vast majority of them, are going to subordinate their own judgment and their own convictions, and their own responsibilities to represent the people who sent them here, and that they are going to abdicate that responsibility to a group in New York City.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, may I say that once the American people realize that that kind of understanding is abroad, then there will be even less support for the United Nations than there is now.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Yes. I think the Senator from West Virginia is correct in that appraisal and I personally would not like to see less support for the United Nations. I think it has a role to play.

Mr. ROBERT C. BYRD. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the Senator's statement also in that regard.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. I think it has a role to play, but I do not think it is being helped when the American Ambassador makes such a speech. Most of the speech is good, as I said in my opening remarks. I could have delivered that speech very comfortably if he had left out those two paragraphs saying that the Security Council can dictate decisions to the Congress of the United States. I do not believe that people of this country would stand for any such proposal as that. I believe he would be rendering a greater service to this world organization and one which I felt a rapport with, when I came from Okinawa, in 1945, when it was formed. He would be helping that organization if he would carry out the laws of the Congress of the United States and explain to his colleagues in New York in the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations that this is a free country and that we have not turned over the prerogatives of the United States to the United Nations.

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. Mr. President, on another subject, the able columnist, J. F. terHorst, writing in the Washington Star-News of November 30, discussed the meeting between President Ford and Russia's party leader Brezhnev. In this column, Mr. terHorst, who at one time was Special Assistant to Mr. Ford at the White House, said that White House aides stated that something in the personal chemistry of the President's first summit meeting with Brezhnev led the President to accept the Kremlin's

December 2, 1974

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

S 20349

verbal pledge to put a cap on the nuclear bottle.

Mr. terHorst expressed some skepticism. He says:

Maybe so, but we owe ourselves, and the President owes to us, a certain wariness over the process.

Then Mr. terHorst says that any agreements should require verification.

I ask unanimous consent that this column by Mr. J. F. terHorst, captioned, "About the Bear Hug," be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Star-News,  
Nov. 30, 1974]

## ABOUT THE BEAR HUG

(By J. F. terHorst)

President Ford's bear hug with Soviet party leader Brezhnev demonstrates that you can teach a new trick to an old cold warrior.

The trick, in this instance, is Ford's willingness to trust the Russians on several important aspects of nuclear arms limitations. The President and Brezhnev have agreed—verbally—to put an overall ceiling on nuclear missiles and bombers and to limit the number of missiles each country may equip with multiple warheads. Four things should be kept in mind about this Ford-Brezhnev understanding.

First, it is no more than a handshake at this point. It may be that a handshake with the Kremlin leadership is as valid as any paper treaty. Diplomatic history has proven repeatedly that formal treaties also are more often honored in the breach than in their observance.

Secondly, the pact does signify that the concept of detente is still alive and well in both Washington and Moscow. Neither side can afford a costly arms race.

Thirdly, assuming the two sides get their negotiators to agree on technical ways to carry out the Ford-Brezhnev agreement, there still is the question of verification. How will the U.S. know that the Soviets are living up to a true arms limit?

Finally, the Ford-Brezhnev agreement amounts to an increase in weaponry, not a reduction. The two leaders may have agreed at Vladivostok to narrow the negotiating gap, but they have not yet agreed to shrink their nuclear arsenals. The ceilings they talked about are higher than the numbers of weapons both sides possess.

For more than a quarter century, Ford was in the vanguard of those in Congress who did not believe the Russians could be trusted. They bemoaned Yalta, Potsdam and Soviet tinkering with the boundaries of Western Europe and West Berlin time and again. Ford led congressional drives to keep America militarily strong because of the fear that a weak America could not maintain a posture of standing up to the Soviets for very long.

Ford has not, to my knowledge, abandoned that belief. But we are told by White House aides that something in the personal chemistry of his first summit meeting with Brezhnev led the President to accept the Kremlin's verbal pledge to put a cap on the nuclear bottle.

Maybe so. But we owe ourselves, and the President owes to us, a certain wariness over the process. It would not take much for the Vladivostok agreement to come apart at the next round of SALT talks between the negotiators because of the technical difficulties of determining what amounts to true parity between two greatly different systems of nuclear armaments.

Verification becomes essential, then, as a litmus test of any American-Soviet agreement to curb the arms race. For example,

how will we know that the Soviets won't secretly install more multiple warheads than the agreement permits?

To know this becomes particularly important because the Vladivostok pact apparently allows the Russians to retain their advantage in the "throw-weight" of missiles. The more of an edge the Soviets retain, the greater is the need to make sure that they do not exceed any agreed limit on MIRVs.

The next SALT pact must be airtight, without ambiguity. And the only way to insure that is for Ford to insist on some verification system that can test the intentions and the performance of both sides.

If that comes about, then we will know that the bear hugs between Ford and Brezhnev at Vladivostok represent a new reality. Trusting the Russians was never a Ford credo in the past. Now that he is president, it is even more essential that we know he is going to insist on cutting the cards before he accepts any nuclear deal.

## ECONOMIC AND INFLATIONARY POLICIES

Mr. HARRY F. BYRD, JR. On another subject, Mr. President, the Richmond Times-Dispatch of Sunday, December 1, 1974, published an excellent editorial on the Nation's economic and inflationary policies—problems, I should say. The Times-Dispatch editorial says:

The most effective way to solve the Nation's economic problems—to halt soaring prices and rocketing interest rates, to overcome shortages and to combat economic stagnation—is "to put our monetary and fiscal house in order."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this editorial from the Richmond Times-Dispatch, whose editor of the editorial page is Edward Grimsley, be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## CAUSE AND CURE

Reprinted elsewhere in this section today is an article that explains with impressive lucidity the basic cause of inflation and proposes a logical solution. Written by Dr. W. Philip Gramm, professor of economics at Texas A&M, the article should be required reading for every official who has a role in shaping the federal government's economic policies—including the President, his advisors and congressmen.

Essentially, Dr. Gramm believes, the cause of inflation is deficit federal financing. By spending more money each year than it collects in revenues, the federal government expands the nation's supply of money and stimulates the demand for goods and services. Since demand has tended to outpace productivity, the prices of goods and services have increased steadily and immensely.

Dr. Gramm notes that since 1935, federal expenditures have exceeded federal income by a total of \$100 billion. And the government has "financed 40 per cent of that deficit by simply printing money."

When the federal government increases its taxes to finance increased expenditures, there is little resultant difference in the total amount of spending within the economy. Private spending power is reduced by the amount that public spending power is increased. But when the government obtains the extra funds it needs by selling bonds to the Federal Reserve Bank and writing checks on the proceeds, in effect creating new money, there is no decline in the amount of money available for private spending. Instead, there is a net increase in the total amount of money floating around

the economy, and this, in turn, results in a net increase in the "total demand for goods and services," Dr. Gramm notes. And prices, inevitably, go up.

Since its founding, the United States, Dr. Gramm writes, has experienced five major bouts with inflation and each has been associated with a war: The Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, The Civil War, World War II and the Vietnam War. This fifth siege of inflation is the first, he says to extend for a prolonged period beyond the end of a war and into a period of peace.

And why has it done so? Primarily, he contends, because Washington has been trying to substitute money for ideas, operating on the theory that the best way to solve any problem is to smother it with dollar bills. Ever since the Great Society days of President Lyndon Johnson, the federal government has been spraying money all over the place in an effort to eradicate poverty and numerous other social ailments. Many of these programs have been poorly planned and sloppily administered, and the primary result has been waste. Very few problems have been solved.

As a specific example of the ineffectiveness of money alone in solving problems, Dr. Gramm cited the experience of former Mayor John Lindsay of New York City. Mr. Lindsay had suggested, at the beginning of his administration that he could solve his city's problems simply by doubling the size of his budget. But what really happened?

"The day John Lindsay left office," Dr. Gramm writes, "his budget was 2.2 times what it was the day he took office, and by every index from garbage collection to crime in the streets, New York City was a worse place to live the day he left than the day he came. And the reason is that money does not solve problems, ideas solve problems. And government has not had a viable idea in 40 years."

The rate of increase in federal spending in recent years has been dizzying. It took 180 years for the federal budget to go from zero to \$100 billion a year. But it went from \$100 billion to \$200 billion in only ten years, and it has grown from \$200 billion to \$300 billion in only four. At the moment, Dr. Gramm tells us, the "federal government is financing at such a rate that . . . it is absorbing 60 per cent of all the funds raised in U.S. capital markets."

The most effective way to solve the nation's economic problems—to halt soaring prices and rocketing interest rates, to overcome shortages and to combat economic stagnation—is "to put our monetary and fiscal house in order." The government needs to stop deficit financing, suppress the temptation to apply wage and price controls—which, he notes, have never worked in the history of the world—and permit the economy to adhere as closely as possible to the principles of free enterprise. Big government does not solve problems, and "spending more of the taxpayers' money cannot turn a bad idea into a good one."

Dr. Gramm's solution, however, is not likely to be attempted until and unless the nation obtains a new kind of leadership. Leadership that "can turn this country around." Leadership that will "fulfill the ideals and aspirations of a revolution which occurred almost two hundred years ago." There are men, certainly, who have the ability to provide this kind of leadership. The truly troubling question, though, is whether they have the courage to do so.

## AMENDMENT OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK ACT—CONFERENCE REPORT

The Senate continued with the consideration of the report of the commit-

S 20350

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — SENATE

December 2, 1974

tee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15977) to amend the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. What is the will of the Senate?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I call for the yeas and nays on the conference report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There is not a sufficient second.

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold that?

Mr. ALLEN. Yes, I withhold.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the Senator be willing to make that request tomorrow? I imagine a lot of the members may have gone home because of the weather and other factors.

Mr. ALLEN. I just wish to make sure that there is a ye-and-nay vote, and that it is not passed by a voice vote during some lull in the proceedings.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I agree with the Senator, and I assure him that his rights will be protected.

Mr. ALLEN. I appreciate the assurance of the majority leader.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What time do we come in tomorrow?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is an order that the Senate convene at 10:30 a.m.

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10:30 A.M.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate now stand in adjournment until the hour of 10:30 a.m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5:20 p.m. the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 3, 1974, at 10:30 a.m.

## NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate December 2, 1974:

## THE JUDICIARY

James M. Fitzgerald, of Alaska, to be U.S. district judge for the district of Alaska vice Raymond E. Plummer, retired.

James P. Churchill, of Michigan, to be U.S. district judge for the eastern district of Michigan vice Stephen J. Roth, deceased.

E. Dale Cook, of Oklahoma, to be U.S. district judge for the northern, eastern, and western districts of Oklahoma vice Luther L. Bohannon, retired.

## CORPORATION FOR PUBLIC BROADCASTING

Jack J. Valenti, of Texas, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting for the remainder of the term expiring March 26, 1976, vice Irving Kristol.

## ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Robert C. Seamans, Jr., of Massachusetts, to be Administrator of Energy Research and Development; new position.

## ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Wilson K. Talley, of California, to be an Assistant Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, vice Stanley M. Greenfield, resigned.

## FEDERAL ENERGY ADMINISTRATION

Frank G. Zarb, of New York, to be Administrator of the Federal Energy Administration, vice John C. Sawhill, resigned.

## NATIONAL CREDIT UNION BOARD

Kathryne Ford Vachon, of Florida, to be a Member of the National Credit Union Board for the remainder of the term expiring December 31, 1978, vice Lorena Causey Matthews, resigned.

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

William A. Anders, of Virginia, to be a member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. (New position)

## RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Nell P. Speira, of Illinois, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for the term of 5 years from August 29, 1974. (Reappointment)

## IN THE ARMY

The following-named officers for promotion in the Army of the United States under the provisions of Public Law 92-129:

## ARMY PROMOTION LIST

## To be colonel

Abercrombie, Edward, 258-34-8723.  
 Abscher, Richard L., 342-22-9072.  
 Adams, Basil E., 008-12-8058.  
 Adair, Charles O., 188-24-8295.  
 Adair, John M., 397-28-2973.  
 Aguiar, Edwin M., 122-20-3324.  
 Albright, Anthony F., 155-24-0827.  
 Allaire, Christop E., 032-24-9633.  
 Ament, Richard G., 563-42-3251.  
 Anderson, George B., 585-38-0233.  
 Aronbald, Norman E., 849-98-1583.  
 Arriero, Robert G., 038-20-1404.  
 Ashworth, Servetus, 008-22-8913.  
 Austin, Freddie C., 282-82-9916.  
 Bacon, Willis G., 482-42-1158.  
 Badovinas, Nick J., 865-16-6096.  
 Bailey, George A., 044-24-9890.  
 Baker, Jack E., 514-20-6038.  
 Ballard, Lowell L., 240-80-0847.  
 Barker, Lyle J., Jr., 282-30-5149.  
 Barlow, Keith A., 231-56-9522.  
 Bartlett, Gerald T., 549-40-1308.  
 Barton, Robert H., 223-36-5556.  
 Bartos, Robert E., 316-24-7200.  
 Bartron, Hubert K., 541-26-3184.  
 Basha, Robert T., 248-56-8370.  
 Baxter, George M., 530-16-1229.  
 Bearden, Winston H., 427-64-2290.  
 Bell, Glenn N., 521-42-9083.  
 Belst, Charles A., Jr., 172-26-0002.  
 Benfer, Richard H., 215-28-6360.  
 Benn, Clark H., 136-32-5529.  
 Berg, Roland E., 478-28-3566.  
 Bergeson, Delwood, 519-32-2251.  
 Berry, Fred C., Jr., 331-24-2308.  
 Blockston, Walter J., 078-24-8171.  
 Bills, Arthur D., 057-24-4257.  
 Bishop, Ted E., 277-28-5319.  
 Bjorn, Edward D., 131-22-8402.  
 Blagg, Thomas E., 429-54-0528.  
 Blanna, Gary L., 581-44-3120.  
 Blabuta, Norman G., 454-38-6170.  
 Boden, William C., 140-24-2298.  
 Boshake, Roger H., 485-22-6347.  
 Boose, Gordon D., 205-22-6321.  
 Borum, William S., 499-32-5237.  
 Bouffard, Robert L., 198-24-8174.  
 Bowman, Ronald N., 008-20-5811.  
 Boyd, William P., 245-60-8251.  
 Boyle, Dennis M., 178-24-9662.  
 Bradshaw, Jack O., 316-36-1251.  
 Bramblett, William B., 315-28-2755.  
 Brubears, Bobby P., 400-42-4368.  
 Bringham, John L., 549-32-8098.  
 Brinton, John R., 518-26-1546.  
 Brock, Mervin E., 544-26-5802.  
 Brogi, David M., 053-28-8480.  
 Brooks, Buford, 417-38-5219.  
 Brown, Dallas C., Jr., 299-28-6134.  
 Brown, Sam A., 527-34-0399.  
 Browne, Roger J., 225-34-2414.  
 Buckley, Paul R., 023-24-1154.  
 Bullock, Victor T., 442-32-7043.  
 Bunker, Robert M., 031-30-2292.  
 Burbach, Frederick, 507-30-1460.  
 Burbules, Peter G., 352-24-3958.  
 Burns, William F., 161-28-1817.  
 Bush, Emory W., 239-40-7506.  
 Bussey, Charles D., 579-38-4703.  
 Butler, Joe C., 463-40-4467.  
 Callaway, Luke L., Jr., 408-54-8085.  
 Caron, John A., 502-22-3967.  
 Carr, Robert F., 254-44-8234.  
 Carroll, William F., 087-26-3397.  
 Carter, Leonard E., 559-36-7072.  
 Chambers, Andrew P., 578-38-2372.  
 Chambers, John A., 503-30-5170.  
 Chandler, Edwin W., 224-40-5021.  
 Chandler, James D., 407-38-9413.  
 Chesbro, John S., 019-22-8644.  
 Chikalla, Gerald G., 399-26-0820.  
 Chomko, Gene N., 192-24-8987.  
 Christenson, Willar, 508-36-2087.  
 Chritton, William R., 498-36-4236.  
 Clark, Davis, 425-48-2986.  
 Cocke, Eugene R., 238-44-0212.  
 Coggins, James E., 256-38-5813.  
 Coleman, Alton H., 254-48-0407.  
 Collins, Harold E., 242-38-8382.  
 Corbin, Delmar L., 481-24-9796.  
 Cottle, Robert E., 235-40-8838.  
 Crancer, John W., 514-40-3555.  
 Crisp, William H., 258-38-5969.  
 Croft, John A., 207-26-8153.  
 Crook, George R., 465-36-6197.  
 Cuthbertson, Robert, 040-28-2599.  
 Cutolo, Edward P., 110-24-5186.  
 Dambrauskas, Vincent T., 386-32-3884.  
 Dandridge, James T., 421-38-8671.  
 Daniels, Geoffrey M., 140-24-0584.  
 Darling, Sterling P., 482-40-4828.  
 Davis, James M., 237-48-1174.  
 Davis, Roger K., 540-36-6500.  
 Davis, Sidney, 161-22-4887.  
 Davis, Willis L., 246-40-7704.  
 Dawkins, Peter M., 385-32-5992.  
 Day, Frank L., 229-42-6141.  
 Defatta, Vincent P., 439-44-2903.  
 Dehrkoop, Clinton B., 526-60-1961.  
 Deitch, Raymond, 197-24-8338.  
 Delandro, Donald J., 433-48-7552.  
 Delaney, Robert F., 067-26-8514.  
 Denman, Jerry L., 428-50-1986.  
 Detmar, Richard P., 078-22-6123.  
 Devers, John P., 161-26-0440.  
 Dewey, Desmond D., 043-24-9016.  
 Dewitt, William W., 327-24-3424.  
 Dillon, Gregory P., 526-30-5057.  
 Dinardo, Nicola, 199-28-0788.  
 Dirmeyer, Robert P., 462-40-5629.  
 Dister, Arthur C., Jr., 293-26-9326.  
 Dixon, Herbert M., 462-44-4994.  
 Dockler, Gordon S., 513-24-6670.  
 Donohue, John E., 139-22-1442.  
 Doty, Daniel W., 532-28-3751.  
 Dozier, James L., 261-42-4971.  
 Drexler, Charles H., 257-48-3800.  
 Driscoll, Paul C., 516-26-9929.  
 Drudik, Robert L., 398-28-1145.  
 Druit, Clifford A., 442-30-1785.  
 Dugan, John E., 076-22-4253.  
 Dunaway, Roy S., 255-40-9418.  
 Durkin, Michael J., 194-26-7894.  
 Edgar, James S., 136-32-5228.  
 Ellis, Alvin C., 420-62-8631.